

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-2, 4-5, and 7-23 are pending in the application, with claim 1 being the independent claim. Claims 1, 22, and 23 have been amended to clarify the invention. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Based on the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,943,591 to Hannan (hereinafter "Hannan").

Claims 3, 22, and 23 were objected to, but indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

Applicant disagrees that Hannan teaches the combination of features recited in Applicant's claim 1 (even prior to the amendments made herein), and reserves the right to argue these distinctions in the future. For example, Hannan determines defects based on voltage level spread (S_h-S_l) of the envelope of the differential signal, when this spread is below a certain threshold, e.g. 100mV. (See, Hannan, col. 5, lines 1-8). Hannan does not make its fault determination based on the common mode of the differential signal, as recited in Applicant's claims.

However, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include a portion, but not all of, the features of allowable claim 3. Specifically, the features that are specifically recited in claim 3 have been added to claim 1, but the

features of intervening claim 2 have not been added, as these additional features are not believed to be necessary to overcome the cited art.

Based on the discussion above, Applicant requests that the rejection under 35 § U.S.C. 102(e) of claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that claim 1 be passed to allowance. Claims 2, 4-5, and 7-23 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, and therefore are patentable for being dependent on an allowable base claim, in addition to their own patentable features.

Accordingly, based on the discussion above, Applicant requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that claims 1, 2, 4-5, and 7-23 be passed to allowance.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Jeffrey T. Helvey

Jeffrey T. Helvey
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,757

Date: 5/04/08

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

817914_1.DOC